

Submission under CFR 1.114
Application No. 10/801,546
Attorney Docket No. 042122

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8-13 and 17-36 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 4, 18, 20, 24, 28 and 30 are herein amended. Claims 14-16 are herein cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by **Toguchi** (U.S. Patent No. 6,747,287; hereinafter referred to as “Toguchi ‘287”). Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite a perylene compound instead of either one of or both of a perylene compound and an anthanthrene compound.

The Office Action relies on Toguchi ‘287, formula A in the rejection of claim 1. Specifically, the Office Action states that Toguchi ‘287 corresponds to claim 1 when in formula A, X is a C₂₂ condensed aromatic structure. (Office Action, page 3.) The C₂₂ condensed aromatic structure relied on by the Examiner corresponds to the anthanthrene compound recited in original claim 1.

Amended claim 1 no longer recites the anthanthrene compound.

The perylene compound as recited in claim 1 requires that the compound be substituted by Formula 2, which is a styryl group substituted by a diarylamino group.

Toguchi ‘287 discloses that X in Formula [A] can be perylene. (Col. 3, lines 62-65.) One of the diarylamino groups in Formula [A] can include a styryl group as a substituent. (Col. 4,

lines 1-4.) However, Toguchi '287 does not disclose the perylene compound itself substituted by a styryl group and the styryl group substituted by a diarylamino group.

In the Interview dated September 7, 2006, the Examiner acknowledged that Toguchi '287 does not disclose the perylene compound as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, Toguchi '287 does not disclose the elements as recited in claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

A. Toguchi '287 in view of Ohashi

Claims 1 and 14-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Toguchi '287 in view of **Ohashi** (U.S. Patent No. 5,200,668). Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Applicant respectfully submits that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would not have been motivated to combine the teachings of Ohashi with the teachings in Toguchi '287.

Toguchi '287 relates to a semiconductor device having an organic semiconductor film. The organic thin film transistor in Toguchi '287 is disclosed as improving response speed. However, Ohashi discloses a luminescence element having high luminance and high stability. One of ordinary skill in the art would not have a need to combine a luminescence element with an organic thin film transistor disclosed as having an improved response speed. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention would not be motivated to combine the teachings of Toguchi '287 with the teachings of Ohashi.

Therefore, claims 1 and 17-36 are non-obvious over Toguchi '287 in view of Ohashi.

B. Toguchi '097

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 8-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over **Toguchi** (U.S. Patent No. 6,753,097; hereinafter referred to as "Toguchi '097"). Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Applicant respectfully submits that Toguchi '097 does not disclose a perylene compound substituted by two or more styryl groups each substituted by a diarylamino group as recited in amended claim 1.

The perylene compound as recited in claim 1 requires that the compound be substituted by Formula 2, which is a styryl group substituted by a diarylamino group.

Toguchi '097 discloses a perylene compound. (Col. 3, lines 20-30.) The perylene compound is formula C1. R^1 through R^4 in formula C1 can be a styryl group. (Col. 3, lines 31-35; col. 10, lines 22-25.) In addition, at least one of R^1 through R^4 is a diarylamino group. (Col. 3, lines 30-45.) However, Toguchi '287 does not disclose the perylene compound having a styryl group substituted by a diarylamino group.

In the Interview dated September 7, 2006, the Examiner acknowledged that Toguchi '097 does not disclose the compounds as recited in claim 1.

The Office Action cited Toguchi '097, col. 5, lines 3-7. (Office Action, page 5.) This passage discloses that a benzoperylene compound having a diarylamino group as a substituent can provide light-emission with a higher brightness if it also separately includes an aryl group

having a styryl group as a substituent. This passage does not disclose a perylene compound having a styryl group substituted by a diarylamino group.

The Office Action allegedly implies that aryl is generic and that the diarylamino group is encompassed within the aryl group. (Office Action, page 5.)

Applicant submits that the diarylamino group is not encompassed within the aryl group. The diarylamino group is encompassed within the generic group of amino compounds.

Furthermore, even assuming that it would have been obvious to use a diarylamino group in place of the aryl compound, as alleged by the Office Action, this still does not disclose a perylene compound having a substituted styryl group substituted by a diarylamino group. If the aryl compound is replaced with a diarylamino group, then the perylene compound would have a diarylamino group as a substituent which is substituted by a styryl group.

The Office Action alleges that it would have been obvious to have phenyl or naphthyl as the aryl group (Office Action, page 5.) Even assuming that it would have been obvious to have phenyl or naphthyl as the aryl group, this does not disclose a perylene compound having a substituted styryl group substituted by a diarylamino group. If the aryl compound is replaced with a phenyl or naphthyl group, then the perylene compound would have a phenyl or naphthyl group as a substituent which is substituted by a styryl group.

Therefore, Toguchi '097 does not disclose the elements as recited in claims 1 and 11.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8-13 and 17-36 based on Toguchi '287, Toguchi '287 in view of Ohashi, and Toguchi '097 is hereby solicited.

Submission under CFR 1.114
Application No. 10/801,546
Attorney Docket No. 042122

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, Applicant submits that the claims, as herein amended, are in condition for allowance. Applicant requests such action at an early date.

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



Andrew G. Melick

Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 56,868

Telephone: (202) 822-1100

Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

AGM/tw